



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/675,370	09/30/2003	Ralph Peter Stodd	7721-C2	5984

7590 03/15/2006

Alan F. Meckstroth
JACOX, MECKSTROTH & JENKINS
Suite 2
2310 Far Hills Building
Dayton, OH 45419-1575

EXAMINER

CASTELLANO, STEPHEN J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3727

DATE MAILED: 03/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/675,370

Applicant(s)

STODD, RALPH PETER

Examiner

Stephen J. Castellano

Art Unit

3727

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/7/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

Art Unit: 3727

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Diamond et al. (Diamond) in view of Brifcani et al. (Brifcani).

Diamond discloses a sheet metal can shell having a crown, center panel, curved panel wall, countersink and a chuckwall, the chuckwall has a slightly S-curved intermediate wall configuration as shown at 36 and 60 in Fig. 2 (but also shown in Fig. 1, 3-5, 11A and 11B), the width between the inner and outer walls of the countersink is extremely small when compared to the large radius of curvature of the curved panel wall at 44 (domed wall) of Fig. 2 as well as Fig. 1, 3-5, 11A and 11B. Diamond discloses the invention except for angle of extension of the chuckwall of at least 16 degrees. Brifcani teaches a chuckwall as shown in Fig. 4 and 5 with a chuckwall angle C of between 20-60 degrees as stated in col. 3, lines 34-38 and in col. 4, lines 14-17. It would have been obvious to modify the chuckwall to have an angle greater than 16 degrees for the reasons advanced by Brifcani in col. 4, lines 25-28 to prevent the chuck from entering too deeply into the countersink or anti-peaking bead.

Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bozek et al. (Bozek) in view of Brifcani and Bulso, Jr. et al. (Bulso).

Bozek discloses a sheet metal can shell having a crown, center panel 22, curved panel wall 29, countersink 25 and a chuckwall (23 in Fig. 4 and 6), the width between the inner and

Art Unit: 3727

outer walls of the countersink is small (approximately 2×0.012 inch as derived from $B = 0.012$ inch as shown in Fig. 4 and as discussed in col. 3, lines 22-23) when compared to the large radius of curvature of the curved panel wall 29. Diamond discloses the invention except for angle of extension of the chuckwall of at least 16 degrees and the slightly S-curved configuration of the chuckwall. Brifcani teaches a chuckwall as shown in Fig. 4 and 5 with a chuckwall angle C of between 20-60 degrees as stated in col. 3, lines 34-38 and in col. 4, lines 14-17. It would have been obvious to modify the chuckwall to have an angle greater than 16 degrees for the reasons advanced by Brifcani in col. 4, lines 25-28 to prevent the chuck from entering too deeply into the countersink or anti-peaking bead. Bulso teaches a slightly S-curved configuration for a chuckwall as shown in Fig. 5, 6 and 8. It would have been obvious to form annular curves of any shape including an S-curve into the chuckwall to reinforce the chuckwall to provide added strength to resist deformation in a radial direction.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-19 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-6 of U.S. Patent No. 6,419,110 to Stodd in view of Bulso. Stodd discloses the invention except for the slightly S-curved configuration of the chuckwall. Bulso teaches a slightly S-curved configuration for a chuckwall as shown in Fig. 5, 6 and 8. It would have been obvious to form annular curves of any shape including an S-curve into the chuckwall to reinforce the chuckwall to provide added strength to resist deformation in a radial direction.


Claims 1-19 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-23 of U.S. Patent No. 6,516,968 to Stodd in view of Bulso. Stodd discloses the invention except for the slightly S-curved configuration of the chuckwall. Bulso teaches a slightly S-curved configuration for a chuckwall as shown in Fig. 5, 6 and 8. It would have been obvious to form annular curves of any shape including an S-curve into the chuckwall to reinforce the chuckwall to provide added strength to resist deformation in a radial direction.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen J. Castellano whose telephone number is 571-272-4535. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 6:30-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan J. Newhouse can be reached on 571-272-4544. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3727

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Stephen J. Castellano
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3727

sjc